

**North Carolina Wireless 911 Board
MINUTES
December 1, 2006**

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guest</u>
Wayne Bowers (NCLM)	Ron Adams (ITS)	David Barnes (Poyner & Spruill LLP)
Robert Cherry (Tarboro Police Chief)	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Jim Blackburn (NCACC)
Dave Corn (Yadkin Valley Telephone)	Richard Taylor (ITS)	Belinda Gurkins (Embarq)
Bill Craigle (Alltel)	Leslie Tripp (ITS)	William Hightower (BellSouth)
Christi Derreberry (Sprint/Nextel)		Patti McKenna (Sprint)
Betty Dobson (NCNENA)		Steven Newton (Orange County EM)
David Dodd (NCAPCO)		Edwin M. Speas (Poyner & Spruill LLP)
Joe Durham (NCACC)		Susan Waddell (NCAPCO/Gaston Co)
Anand Gandhi (VZW)		
Trey Greene (Cingular)		
Steve Stoneman (ITS)		
 <u>Members Absent</u>	 <u>Staff Absent</u>	
George Bakolia (NC CIO)		
Slayton Stewart (Carolina West Wireless)		
Allen Whitaker (Davie County Sheriff)		

Chair's Welcoming Remarks:

Chairman Stoneman welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order.

Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement:

Chairman Stoneman read the Conflict Of Interest Statement and asked if anyone wished to note any potential conflicts. Trey Greene (Cingular) replied that he would not vote regarding agenda item 7, per Cingular's company policy regarding potential conflicts of interest. Bill Craigle (Alltel) added that he would refrain from voting on items

7 and 8. Joe Durham asked Chairman Stoneman to confirm that any Board member can indicate that he or she perceives a conflict of interest with any agenda item at any time during the meeting. This allows a Board member to have the option to determine whether or not a true conflict exists after hearing discussion of the agenda item. Then he or she can decide whether or not to abstain from voting. Chairman Stoneman confirmed that such a declaration can be made at any time during the meeting.

Approval of minutes

Chairman Stoneman asked if anyone wished to make changes or additions to the minutes of the September 22, 2006 Wireless Board meeting. Joe Durham moved that the minutes be accepted as presented, Dave Corn seconded, and the motion carried.

Update on TracFone litigation

Chairman Stoneman asked Richard Bradford to report on the current status of the TracFone litigation. Richard reminded everyone that as part of the settlement agreement the Board had indicated that it would consider legislative proposals from TracFone. He noted that Eddie Speas and David Barnes of Poyner & Spruill, LLP, were present today to answer any questions Board members might have regarding TracFone's proposed legislative changes. Richard observed that a copy of that proposed change had been posted to the Board members page on the website for Board member review prior to today's meeting. For the benefit of those who had not reviewed it, he summarized that the TracFone proposal posited that the fee for prepaid providers should be 1% of the purchase price of the service/product being purchased, and that it should be collected at the point of sale and remitted by the retailer. TracFone indicated that it had determined that the 1% would be equivalent to the \$.70/month fee collected by post paid providers. Richard reminded those present that TracFone's business model does not include a direct relationship with the consumer/purchaser at the point of sale. He added that a few states have adopted some measure of point of sale legislation, but in each case those statutes still rely upon the provider to collect and remit, so that issue still remains.

Joe Durham asked if there were any action required of the Board at this time. Richard Bradford replied that there was no specific action required on this proposal at this time, but that it does relate to the next agenda item. It is just presented for the Board's consideration in moving forward with any legislation in the upcoming session.

Chairman Stoneman asked Eddie Speas if Richard had correctly summarized TracFone's position, and Mr. Speas acceded that he had. Mr. Speas then asked if he could offer a few observations, and Chairman Stoneman gave him the floor. Mr. Speas noted that this issue of prepaid wireless fees is a nationwide problem. He stated that TracFone's proposal offers a method that they think is fair to the prepaid community and at least as comprehensive as the present arrangement with respect to providing income to allow the Board to do its work. He added that TracFone would be delighted to discuss any issues the Board might have with regard to the language. He indicated that they would like to work with the Board, saying that they understood that the Board may have a legislative proposal to go to the legislature, and that they would like for this to be a part of it.

Dave Corn asked if the 1% of retail proposed is on a par with the fee presently being charged. Chairman Stoneman observed that it really isn't an "apples to apples" comparison. Richard Taylor observed that it would be very different, as it would be a one-time charge, regardless of the amount, and would not be recurring like the monthly charge. Chairman Stoneman asked Richard Bradford if his understanding that the retailer would remit directly to the Board was correct, and Richard said that was how he understood it to be.

Wayne Bowers asked Mr. Speas what TracFone's rationale was for coming up with the 1%, and Mr. Speas replied that TracFone officials made an estimate based on their business as to what would be equivalent to the \$.70 figure. He added that it is just an estimate, and that they would be delighted to work with the Board to determine if it should be something other than 1%. He also added that 1% of that 1% would be remitted to the retailer as an administrative fee similar to that accorded to CMRS providers.

Christi Derreberry asked if any retail agreements had been worked out, and with whom, or what a draft of such an agreement might look like. Mr. Speas replied that they had not had any discussions with retailers, stating that this would be a duty imposed on retailers as a part of their operations. Presumably, they would collect this fee just as they collect sales tax on all their sales. Mr. Speas speculated that it would be something that could be built into their computer sales system, so it should not be a problem. Christi asked, "What if they say no?", and Mr. Speas said that they wouldn't have discretion to say no, just as they don't have the discretion to say no with respect to collection of sales taxes. He added that there are lots of different ways this issue is being looked at around the country, and that it is a seemingly simple problem, but that every time you move one piece you get another issue. He said that they think this is the best way to go, but that they would be delighted to work with the Board to find some other way to deal with it if the Board believes there is a better way. He stressed that they do think it is a problem that must be addressed.

Mr. Barnes spoke to the question of determining the 1% figure, stating that using the \$50 method of calculation \$.70 equals about 1.4% of \$50. They believe that using point of sale collection will result in more people paying into the system, which translates into more revenue. He said there are a number of different surveys dealing with how different boards are treating this issue across the country, noting that those who use a model similar to our existing one are experiencing the same problems we are. He suggested that Idaho and Hawaii might be good examples to look at, as they have elected to exempt prepaid providers because finding a workable solution was so much trouble. He acknowledged it is a service that consumers want, but added that keeping the legislation up to date with the technology is very difficult.

Update on 911 Legislative Activity

Richard Taylor observed that when the new legislature convenes, 911 will definitely be one of the topics addressed simply based upon the 2005 legislation's requirement that the Joint Legislative Utility Review Committee make a report to the new session. Also,

as evidenced by the previous discussion, TracFone will be pursuing some sort of legislative modifications to 62A. Beyond that, there has been no activity to report upon.

In anticipation of future activity, Richard proposed that a legislative subcommittee be formed to address that activity. He observed that it would be important that the committee be equally representative of both the public and private sectors, and also noted that inviting subject matter experts from outside the Board could be very helpful, provided once again that public/private parity is maintained. He offered that involving stakeholders in the Board's deliberations might help alleviate the "smokestack" effect of many different stakeholders introducing many different legislative proposals. He added that once the subcommittee is formed, he would want to be sure that the Joint Legislative Utility Review Committee was made aware of its existence as a resource.

Joe Durham said that he thought formation of such a subcommittee was a great idea, although he sees time constraints as a potential problem with the holidays just ahead. He said he would hope that the subcommittee could meet and bring recommendations back to the full Board for consideration. The problem would be that the Joint Legislative Utility Review Committee will probably meet before the next full Board meeting, so the recommendations might come too late. He also noted that while he welcomes the participation of other interested parties in the subcommittee deliberations, contributing ideas and observations, he's not sure he would actually want them to be members of the subcommittee. He feels that the subcommittee should make recommendations to the full Board, and that such recommendations should come from Board members or staff, not third parties. Joe also volunteered to be a member of that subcommittee.

Chairman Stoneman asked Richard Taylor what his thoughts were on the number of subcommittee members, and Richard said that he felt a minimum should be four members, but that six would be preferable; three from the public sector and three from the private sector. Robert Cherry, Trey Greene, Christi Derreberry, David Dodd, and Bill Craigle all volunteered to serve along with Joe. Richard Taylor said he would try to contact the members within the next week or so to consider some dates, and that he felt the first meeting could probably take place as a conference call.

Approval of Comprehensive Statewide Wireless Enhanced 911 Plan RFP

Citing confidentiality issues concerning the procurement process, Chairman Stoneman noted that the requirements and contents of the RFP could not be displayed in a public forum (i.e. this meeting). He expressed his hope that Board members had taken advantage of the opportunity to review it on the Board members web page prior to the meeting. He observed that today the Board would vote on the contents and discuss evaluation criteria and methodology.

Richard Taylor explained that while the majority of the document is standard boilerplate, section three encompasses the requirements agreed upon by the members of the RFI review subcommittee, reflecting the work that will be accomplished by the contract recipient. That is the substance of the document that the Board needs to vote to approve today. He said that the second task is to determine how the returned RFPs will be evaluated. The options as he sees them are to allow staff to do the evaluations and

make recommendations to the Board, or to create a subcommittee of the Board to take on that task. His preference is to let staff do it.

Richard Bradford observed that if the Board wished to examine this in detail today, that could be accomplished in closed session. He also noted that in his experiences with procurement, staff typically does perform the evaluations and make the recommendations, although sometimes subcommittees are appointed.

Joe Durham said that as he recalled, evaluation criteria are spelled out within the RFP. Richard Bradford agreed, stating that the only decision the Board needs to make is whether Board members want to participate in reading all of the bids and evaluating those against the criteria that are in the RFP, or whether they are willing to let staff handle that task. Joe observed that he thinks staff will do an excellent job, and said that he would offer that as a motion to approve the RFP as presented and allow staff to evaluate the bids and make recommendations to the Board. During discussion, Dave Corn asked when the bids were expected to be in, and Richard Taylor and Richard Bradford both said that it would probably be within 30-90 days.

Richard Bradford said that typical scheduling would put the bid on the street and identify a date for a pre-bidders conference, at which time the bidders are invited to ask questions. The questions are submitted in writing and they're answered in writing. That constitutes an amendment to the solicitation documents. After that there is a period of time for potential clarification, and the bids are then due. Generally speaking, if the RFP were posted two weeks from today, then the bids would not be due until mid-February.

Chairman Stoneman called the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Cingular Wireless Surcharge Remittance

Richard Bradford called attention to the email received on August 31 from Mark Ashby, Chief Counsel—State Regulatory for Cingular wireless, which was projected on the conference room screen. In that email Mr. Ashby stated that Cingular had determined it was due a refund for pre-October 2005 payments to the NC Wireless Fund, and also that it owed money post-October 2005. He further stated that Cingular had subtracted the alleged refund amount from the current amount due, and was sending a check for the balance due. When this email was discussed at the last NC Wireless 911 Board meeting, the Board instructed Richard Bradford to notify Mr. Ashby that it had received his letter, received his accounting, and was accepting Cingular's check, but not its conclusion. Richard Bradford stated he has done that, but has heard nothing further. Since no response has been forthcoming, Richard Taylor added it to this meeting agenda to determine how to move ahead.

Mr. Bradford observed he could write Mr. Ashby another letter and respectfully request that Cingular remit the amount that it previously deducted. Richard Taylor said that was his recommendation. Chairman Stoneman invited further discussion, and hearing none asked for a motion to accept the staff recommendation. Dave Corn so moved and Betty Dobson seconded. Joe Durham then asked for some clarification. He asked Richard Bradford if Cingular's numbers were correct, and Mr. Bradford reminded him that all numbers submitted by the CMRS providers are necessarily assumed to be correct, as

the Wireless 911 Board has no audit authority to verify them. He added that these numbers do correspond to the numbers submitted to the Board during that time period, and that the accounting is mathematically correct based upon those numbers. That accounting is confidential and cannot be displayed in a public meeting, but has been reviewed by staff, and staff believes it is correct. Wayne Bowers asked if there was a reasonable explanation of why they thought they had overpaid, and Richard Bradford replied that Cingular had not provided any more explanation than what was onscreen. Wayne then asked if there was a reasonable basis for their claim, and Richard replied that he felt that was the question now on the table.

Richard then reviewed the TracFone decision, reminding everyone that it had been unique due to the handset based technology used for accounting of minutes preventing TracFone from accessing customer information to apply a formula to calculate fees. Cingular, however, uses a switch based technology that allows it to access customer minute usage or balances, which in turn allows it to calculate fees based on one of the formulas provided in the statute. Therefore, there is a technological difference between the claim presented by TracFone and the claim presented by Cingular. Richard added that both companies have tried to position themselves to argue that the construction of the statute is what controls the outcome. He said that while he is not agreeing or disagreeing with that position, he would point out that part of the reasoning of this Board in agreeing to refund TracFone was that technological difference.

Noting that Trey Greene and Anand Gandhi were abstaining from this vote, Chairman Stoneman called the motion. At that time Bill Craigle and Christi Derreberry also indicated they were not going to vote. The remaining quorum unanimously voted to approve the motion.

Request from Virgin Mobile for Refund of 911 Surcharge Remittance

Richard Taylor told Board members that this is another request from a prepaid provider, Virgin Mobile, for a refund of all surcharge remittances prior to October, 2005. He projected the letter on the conference room screen for all to view, and observed that Virgin Mobile was contending that prior to the legislation that went into effect in October 2005 they were not required to remit. Mr. Taylor noted it was essentially the same issue as the one presented by Cingular, and Richard Bradford concurred. Mr. Taylor then stated that the staff recommendation was to deny the refund request, as staff believes the statute does apply, and as Virgin Mobile customers in North Carolina have certainly availed themselves of wireless 911 service. He observed that once again the technological differences between TracFone and Virgin Mobile preclude using the TracFone settlement as a justification for refunding Virgin Mobile's remittances.

Joe Durham asked Richard Taylor to explain how Virgin Mobile had calculated its remittances, and Richard said that although they had never indicated what formula they used, he suspects they were using a formula taking the total number of dollars each month and dividing it by \$0.70, which was commonly used prior to the 2005 legislative changes. Joe observed that then we really don't know whether their numbers are correct or not, and Chairman Stoneman replied that these numbers represent money actually paid into the Wireless Fund. Joe replied by asking if there is no defined process by which "TracFone or other similar providers handle the fee." Richard Taylor replied

that the process he outlined is one that the other providers were using prior to the 2005 legislative changes, and that Tax Partners, which files for several prepaid providers, had stated that was the process they used. Joe then said that any number of prepaid providers could be waiting to make similar refund requests because of the negotiated settlement with TracFone, and Chairman Stoneman agreed.

Richard Taylor again reminded everyone that the TracFone situation was unique because of the handset based customer record of available minutes or minutes used. No other companies use that same technology, and their technology does allow them to access those records and make calculations from them. Joe Durham said that he didn't understand the difference, and Richard told him that Virgin Mobile could access its switch at any time and determine how many minutes were still available to its customers, whereas TracFone could not. He added that technology distinction was the main reason the Board chose to settle with TracFone.

Dave Corn then stated that he was having difficulty accepting the technology difference as being a justification for settling with TracFone because technologies change. He said he thought the Board had settled with TracFone because the Board felt it couldn't win in court. Christi Derreberry observed that it gave us a chance to move forward and make recommendations to change the law. Dave agreed, then asked, "...if the Board accepts the staff recommendation, how long can we delay until legislative changes are enacted to address this problem?" Richard Bradford responded by saying that it would be highly unusual for the legislature to pass a statute that was retroactive.

Dave Corn then said that he thought we had taken the path of least resistance with TracFone, but that if "everybody comes back and asks for some money, we may have made a mistake." Richard Bradford reminded him that part of the discussion at the time was a forecast that a settlement with TracFone would precipitate further requests. Dave replied, "I agree, and here they are. So we're between a rock and a hard place."

Joe Durham said, "It's hard for me to say no to this request without having all the data, all the information, and also the precedent that this would establish for other requests as they come in." He observed we will certainly have other similar requests, that he had no idea how many other prepaid providers were marketing phones at places like Wal-Mart, and that he would have reservations about trusting staff to say no to this request right now. Chairman Stoneman asked him if he had an alternative recommendation for moving forward, and Joe said he did not.

Robert Cherry observed it was pretty obvious that they (Virgin Mobile) thought they owed the money, as they had calculated it in some fashion and remitted it. Joe Durham noted that we did not know how accurate those calculations were, and Robert replied that they certainly didn't pay any more than they felt they had to, speculating that this has only come about because of the TracFone decision. Dave Corn noted that Virgin Mobile is a business, and that if any company out there knows that there is a bunch of money to be grabbed, it is going to "go for it" if it helps the company show a profit. He added, "I don't want to lose sight of the fact that our reason for being here is to provide funds for 911 service for consumers, and I'm concerned about giving money back."

Chairman Stoneman observed that unfortunately there was a very gray piece of legislation out there that created this whole situation. Joe Durham said that he agreed that the customers did receive the benefit of being able to call 911, and that many did. He added that whatever decision the Board makes, it needs to be applied consistently in the future, acknowledging that TracFone was a unique situation.

Chairman Stoneman asked Richard Bradford what the contents of a response to the request might be. Richard replied that if the Board simply wished to deny the request, it would be a short letter. He added that was not the message he was picking up from the board, however. He said that he senses the Board would like additional information about how Virgin Mobile remitted and why it remitted. Another issue that must be considered would be how the Board would handle the fact that the money already collected has already been distributed to the PSAPs pursuant to the statute. Certain mechanical applications of the statute would also have to be considered. To accomplish all that he feels the response would have to be more detailed and invite further discussion, adding that he would be happy to craft such a response in conjunction with Richard Taylor.

Chairman Stoneman asked if that would be in the form of a draft to be discussed at the next meeting, or distributed before that time. Richard Bradford observed that the next meeting was not too distant, so that might be soon enough. Richard Taylor asked if that would be a draft submitted for approval at that meeting, and that the letter wouldn't be sent until after that meeting. Richard Bradford replied that would be one way to do it, or he could go ahead and send a letter requesting additional information, explaining why, and that a response might then be available for review at the January Board meeting.

Anand Gandhi, while noting that he would not be voting on this question, asked to make an observation. He asked if Virgin Mobile actually uses a switch, or if they are more like TracFone. Richard Taylor said they are actually using Cingular's (Virgin Mobile's host network) switch, and Trey Greene confirmed that the HLR (Home Location Register) validates that the customer has minutes. Betty Dobson asked how many other prepaid companies work only under one host carrier, i.e. through a host carrier's switch, and Richard Taylor replied that TracFone was the only one that did not function that way during the time frame in question; all the others did. Betty then reasoned that all the other carriers had the ability to calculate what they owed at that time, and that they knew what they were paying and why. Richard Taylor agreed.

Chairman Stoneman summarized the discussion, instructing Richard Bradford and Richard Taylor to draft a letter to be circulated prior to the next meeting for consideration at that meeting. Joe Durham stressed that in addition to soliciting more detailed information, he wanted Richard Bradford and Richard Taylor to draft a policy that could be applicable in all similar situations.

Richard Taylor asked Richard Bradford if this situation wasn't virtually identical to the one just discussed regarding Cingular's request for a refund. Richard Bradford replied that the principal difference is that Cingular has already provided detailed accounting. Richard Taylor rephrased his question by asking if we weren't handling each situation differently when they are essentially the same. Chairman Stoneman agreed, suggesting that an agenda topic at the next meeting, crafted by Richard Taylor and Richard

Bradford, address how to approach these questions in a consistent manner. Joe Durham suggested that in the meantime, as a courtesy to both companies, staff should send each of them a letter stating what we are doing, assuring them that we are not simply ignoring their requests. Chairman Stoneman agreed, instructing staff to do that.

Update on 2006 CMRS Survey

Richard Taylor reported that as of this morning he had received sixteen responses (nineteen individual responses, but three represent the same company operating under different names) to the survey that the Board had approved at the last Board meeting. The summary of responses projected on the conference room screen represented the twelve responses he had received when crafting the agenda item.

In looking at the responses he observed that Cingular appears to partner with the largest number of resellers, followed by Sprint-Nextel. He found interesting the fact that of the twelve responses included in the agenda, only eight are presently remitting the fee; four are not. One prepaid provider reported that Cingular was remitting the fee in its behalf, although Richard could find no indication or confirmation of that in Cingular's records. Richard is pleased that the survey responses are providing factual information regarding questions the Board has had about resellers to supplement anecdotal information that has circulated in the past. He is hopeful that all the responses will be in within the next few weeks, and is confident that we will be able to glean even more information from the total pool of responses.

Richard cited responses to question 10 as one good example of how this survey has already helped staff. Now staff has modified the CMRS report form to request a distinction be made between remittances for prepaid and postpaid service. He added that the information we receive from the survey will not only be useful in accounting, but also in helping the Board craft or modify future legislation. For example, the responses to questions 13 and 14 show that only seven of the twelve respondents are seeking cost recovery. Since all are paying into the fund, but five are not seeking cost recovery, a potential exists for the cost recovery side of the fund balance to grow, drawing the attention of legislators who want to know why. This is a good indicator that we might want to once again adjust percentages or reduce the surcharge or both.

Richard noted that he found the juxtaposition of answers to questions 19 and 20 very interesting as well, as he expected the answers to both questions to correlate more closely than they did. Richard finished his presentation noting the fact that North Carolina's surcharge administrative fee is smaller than many contiguous states, although nine of the twelve respondents indicated it was sufficient, and said that he expects the information gleaned from the survey will be very helpful to the legislative committee.

Before moving to the next agenda item, Bill Craigle asked if any discussion had ever taken place regarding defining the surcharge as a tax instead of a fee. He mentioned it because he felt that if the surcharge were indeed a tax, then the fund could not be raided by the Governor or Legislature as it has been in the past. Richard Taylor noted that the topic had been discussed when crafting the legislation that was approved in 2005, with a consensus that the surcharge was a fee. Richard Bradford added that a

couple of states do call it a tax, and it is collected by a taxing authority within those states, but for the most part it is treated as a fee. He explained that one of the fundamental distinctions is that a fee is not part of general revenue; it's for a limited purpose. He also observed that many people believe that when a fee is authorized by the legislature, federal or state, there is a presumption that the fee will be collected for awhile and then go away after having achieved its purpose. Mr. Bradford added that he thought periodic re-examination of the topic was prudent and useful. Bill then asked if his expectation that the fund would be safe from raiders was correct, and Richard Bradford replied that would depend on whether and/or how the fund would be kept out of general revenue, or, if it were part of general revenue, how the appropriation process would impact it. Bill said he brought up the subject because he anticipates a large budget shortfall in 2007, and that if there is a surplus in the fund, it would be a tempting target.

Chairman Stoneman observed that if there is going to continue to be a surplus, then the Board needs to re-examine the fee and possibly adjust it down again. Richard Taylor observed that while there might be a surplus regarding companies not seeking cost recovery, there are many small providers who cannot even recover all that they are entitled to because their small customer base does not generate enough dollars for them. He observed that we are holding invoices for some of them for six or seven months just waiting for them to contribute enough money to the fund. Richard noted that future deliberations need to take them into account as well, that it is not as easy as just reducing the surcharge amount.

Status of Phase 1 / Phase II Wireless 911 in North Carolina

Chairman Stoneman said that there had been a request that staff not go into as much detail in the presentation of staff reports during meetings, although the information would still be provided in the agenda for Board member review. In response to that request he has asked staff to limit any verbal reporting to significant events or anomalies only. He asked the Board at this time if anyone had any objections to that. Everyone agreed that was a good idea.

That said, Ron Adams reported that there have been no significant deployment developments since the last meeting. Richard Taylor added that Oak Island Police Department has asked to be given Primary PSAP status again. They had been a Primary PSAP in the past, and had asked to be removed a couple of years ago. Now, after elections, there is a new Chief seeking reinstatement of that status. Once the paperwork is complete, that will come before the Board for approval, probably in January.

Update on Annual PSAP Audit

Leslie Tripp reported that three of the 2005 annual PSAP audits are still not complete. She said it has been a long year with these reports, but the end appears to be in sight. Of those three, two are in review and a response from the third has not yet come in.

Field Reports

Chairman Stoneman reiterated the request for staff to be brief with reports, touching only on key topics of interest. Richard Taylor said that his trip to the NASNA meeting in Indianapolis was one of the highlights of the past two months for him. He said that gathering with his counterparts from across the country to sit down and discuss how everybody is contending with the common issues they all face is very informative and helpful. He also has been contacted by many folks interested in the upcoming RFP, and has answered many questions about that process.

Ron Adams reported that he had sent a survey letter to PSAPs that had never sent attendees to wireless classes, and found that most cited overtime or travel expenses as the reasons they had not been able to participate. Many, however, upon receipt of the letter, did ask him if he could bring a class to them, so he has been able to take advantage of those invitations and has presented several classes for those PSAPs. Ron also noted that he had been continuing to work with the Video Networking Services group on a web based course offering.

Administrative Reports

Leslie Tripp reported all has been running smoothly, with nothing out of the ordinary to report besides the fact that State auditors had recently completed our annual audit. That audit had also gone very smoothly, and an exit interview with the auditors would take place next week.

Chairman Stoneman then announced to the Board that Leslie would be taking a new position with DHHS. He thanked her for all the work she has done for the Board, noting that during his tenure with the Board we have always sailed through the annual audits without any issues at all, and that nearly all the credit for that success was due to her. He told her we will miss her greatly, and wished her all the best, and led the Board in a round of applause in recognition of her.

Adjourn

Chairman Stoneman asked if there were any further business. Joe Durham noted that this was the first meeting where the agenda and agenda book were online rather than hard copy in a binder. He said that it looked like many people had printed out the online documentation and that if the intent was to shift responsibility for that from the Board to the individual members, that should just be stated up front. He pointed out that his Verizon cellular PDA doesn't get a signal in the conference room, so he was unable to access the online content as he had intended to in the meeting.

Chairman Stoneman acknowledged that even he had printed out some items of interest to him, adding that he thought the volume of printed material throughout the room was considerably less than before. He said that he personally preferred this method, but that if consensus was to go back to the old way he would honor that consensus.

Joe said that if we want to go paperless, then we should have access to the technology that allows us to go paperless. He said that if we all had laptops and could access the agenda in a paperless fashion, then he would be all for it, but that we are not there yet. Chairman Stoneman reiterated that in looking around the room there is a significant

reduction in the amount of paper present, and that some of that paper was a printout of the agenda that had been provided to each Board member. Joe then said he just wanted make the point.

Richard Taylor volunteered that if people wanted to bring their laptops, staff could provide CDs containing the agenda and agenda packet. Joe said that if everybody had laptops and could be provided with CDs then we could truly be paperless. Chairman Stoneman then said that if anyone would like to do that, let staff know in advance and a CD would be ready when they arrive for the meeting. Joe asked if there would be a laptop, too, as he didn't want to have to bring his own. Chairman Stoneman said no, there would not be laptops available, only CDs.

Richard Taylor asked Joe if having a Verizon signal in the room would meet his needs, and Joe said that it would. Chairman Stoneman observed that there is also WiFi connectivity in the building, and that he would look into providing a public access capability within the conference room so that the online documents could be accessed that way.

Chairman Stoneman asked for a motion to adjourn, Dave Corn so moved, Robert Cherry seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.